

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, 1903.

The Remonstrance is published annually by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, California, South Dakota, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

State Organizations Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Thirty-two Branch Committees; members in 216 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD, President.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY, } Vice-
MRS. EBEN S. DRAPER, } Presidents.
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MRS. ROBERT W. LORD, Secretary,
405 Marlboro Street, Boston.

NEW YORK.

MRS. LYMAN ABBOTT, President.
MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, 1st Vice-President.
MRS. ELIHU ROOT,
MRS. RICHARD WATSON GILDER, } Vice-
MRS. WILLIAM PUTNAM, } Presidents.
MRS. PHILIP SCHUYLER VAN
PATTEN,
MRS. WILLIAM J. WALLACE,
MRS. GEORGE PARKHURST,
MRS. GEORGE WADDINGTON, Treasurer.
MRS. GEORGE PHILLIPS, Secretary,
165 West 83d Street, New York City.

Chairmen of Auxiliaries.

MRS. WILLIAM PUTNAM,
70 Willow Street, Brooklyn.
MRS. PHILIP SCHUYLER VAN PATTEN,
Prospect Avenue, Mt. Vernon.
MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL,
9 Hall Place, Albany.
MRS. GEORGE PARKHURST,
560 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo.

ILLINOIS.

MRS. CAROLINE F. CORBIN, President.
MRS. S. M. NICKERSON,
MRS. R. J. OGLESBY, } Vice-Presidents.
MRS. HORATIO N. MAY,
MRS. JAMES B. BARNET, Secretary,
463 Elm Street, Chicago.

OREGON.

MRS. R. W. WILBUR, President.
MRS. W. S. LADD, 1st Vice-President.
MRS. J. B. MONTGOMERY, 2d Vice-President.
MRS. WALLACE McCAMANT, Treasurer.
MISS ELIZABETH M. CARSON, Secretary,
183 20th Street, North, Portland.

IOWA COMMITTEE.

MRS. J. H. MERRILL, 509 W. Fourth Street,
Des Moines.

MRS. MARTIN FLYNN, Des Moines.
MISS EMILY STOWE, Des Moines.
MRS. SIMON CASADY, Des Moines.

RHODE ISLAND COMMITTEE.

Providence.

MRS. WILLIAM ELY, Chairman.

WASHINGTON COMMITTEE.

Seattle.

MRS. JOHN LEARY, President.
MRS. T. B. HARDIN, Vice-President.
MRS. G. W. BACON, Secretary,
512 10th Avenue, South.
MRS. ALFRED DOWNING, Treasurer.

Tacoma.

MRS. CHAUNCEY W. GRIGGS, President.
MRS. FITCH B. STACEY, Vice-President.
MRS. A. B. BULL, Secretary,
105 N. E. Street.

PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE.

THE *Woman's Journal* has for some time been urging the suffrage organizations to concentrate their energies on the attempt to persuade legislatures to grant "Presidential suffrage" to women, — the right, that is, to vote for Presidential electors. It is announced that this demand will be made this year upon the legislatures of Kansas, Minnesota, Illinois, Rhode Island, and perhaps other states.

The arguments by which the *Woman's Journal* supports this proposal are in substance as follows: That in many states the constitutions preclude the legislatures from extending the suffrage to women in local and state elections; that the difficulty in the way of securing suffrage through amendments to state constitutions, which require a two-thirds vote in one or two legislatures and a majority vote at the polls, is very great; but that the provision of the Constitution of the United States that "each state shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof shall direct" the Presidential electors, may be so interpreted as to give a legislature the power to enact that women shall vote for Presidential electors on the same terms as men. The *Woman's Journal* declares: "A bare majority of house and senate, at any session, with or without the approval of the governor, can confer upon its women citizens the highest form of suffrage known in the world."

It is perfectly true that the system, now

universal, of choosing Presidential electors by popular vote, did not always prevail. In the earlier elections, and for a considerable period after the formation of the government, certain of the states chose electors by the vote of their legislatures. It was not until 1880 that the choice of electors was made in all the states by popular vote; for, as late as 1876, Colorado chose its electors by the appointment of its legislature, in order to save an additional election, that state having been admitted into the Union in August of that year.

But, in every case, from the foundation of the government, with the exception of the four suffrage states, the choice of electors has rested back upon the action of the male citizens of the several states, whether exercised directly in a popular vote for electors, or indirectly through the election of members of the legislature, who later appointed the electors by their own votes.

Evidently there is no analogy between these variations in the method of appointing Presidential electors and so revolutionary a change as would be involved in the doubling of the electorate by enacting that women should vote for Presidential electors on the same terms as men. The argument of the *Woman's Journal* comes practically to this: That as the framers of state constitutions, with wise conservatism, have made it impossible for a legislature to extend to women the minor forms of suffrage, it may be demanded of legislatures that they shall usurp an authority which neither state nor federal constitution ever contemplated, by allowing women to vote for Presidential electors, thus providing for them a short cut to "the highest form of suffrage known in the world." In other words, a legislature which cannot constitutionally do the lesser thing shall venture, without any mandate from the voters, to do the greater thing.

Whether a legislature has power for such a subterfuge as this may be left to expounders of the Constitution to determine. But it is significant that although the *Woman's Journal* has been advocating this device for many years, it has never yet found a legislature which was disposed to take the proposal seriously. It is not likely to have any better success this year in persuading legislators to vote for so unwarranted and revolutionary a proposition.

SUFFRAGE MEASURES IN MASSACHUSETTS.

FOUR suffrage propositions were introduced in the Massachusetts legislature in 1902. All of them were defeated, and on only one of them was there a roll-call or a debate.

Upon a petition of Alice Stone Blackwell and others for legislation, to enable women paying taxes to vote in municipal elections, the Committee on Election Laws reported "reference to the next General Court." The report was accepted by the Senate, March 4, and by the House, March 7.

Upon a petition for legislation to allow women to participate in primaries and caucuses for school committee, the committee made a similar report, which was accepted by the House, May 18, and by the Senate, June 2.

Upon a petition for legislation giving to women qualified to vote for school committee the right to vote upon the question of granting liquor licenses, the committee, by a vote of 10 to 1, reported "leave to withdraw." The report was accepted by the Senate, May 20, and by the House, May 23.

Upon a petition of Mrs. Mary A. Livermore and others for the submission of an amendment striking the word "male" from the Constitution, the committee reported "leave to withdraw." An attempt which was made in the House to substitute a resolve for the adverse report, failed by a vote of 45 yeas to 137 nays, with 16 pairs. The House accepted the report March 5, and the Senate concurred March 10.

AN UNDEMOCRATIC DEMAND.

THE demand for municipal suffrage for taxpaying women, which the advocates of woman suffrage are now making, involves a curious departure from their original position. At first they claimed the ballot for women as a natural right; and later, when they found it necessary to abate somewhat that demand, they still urged it as a right which ought to be given to women on precisely the same terms as men. But, when they ask for the ballot for taxpaying women, they ask for the creation of an artificial distinction between different classes of women such as does not exist between corresponding classes of men.

They abandon altogether the large ma-

jority of women who, however intelligent they may be, or however well fitted to act on public questions, do not happen to own property; and they ask that the ballot, so far as women are concerned, may follow upon not intelligence or character, but the mere accident of wealth. By whatever arguments this demand may be supported, it is an undemocratic demand; and it calls for the re-establishment, so far as women are concerned, of those distinctions between property-owners and non-property-owners which by general consent in most states of the Union, have been abolished so far as relates to limitations upon the suffrage for men.

To be consistent, if the ballot is given to women who are taxpayers, because they are taxpayers, it ought to be withdrawn from men who are not taxpayers. Moreover, if the ballot is an appendage to property, and is not the right of a citizen as a citizen, it ought to follow property wherever found, and the owner of property who pays taxes in more than one town or city should have a vote in each. It does not seem probable that any American legislature will consent to a proposal which, at the most, would enfranchise only a small number of women, and, in doing so, would introduce a discrimination so alien to American principles and practices.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN NEW ZEALAND.

WHEN Mr. Seddon, the premier of New Zealand, was in London last August, he received a deputation from the Central Society for Woman's Suffrage. From Mr. Seddon's address, as reported in the *London Times* of August 8, it appears that although he warmly approves of woman suffrage, even he does not favor permitting women to enter Parliament. The *Times* reports his remarks thus:—

"There had been a few, but very few, who had advocated the entrance of women into Parliament; he did not, however, regard those advocates as being representative of their sex in the colony. They had made no advance in respect of it. While woman was eminently fitted to exercise her vote and benign influence through that vote, yet she would be out of place in Parliament. Consequently the women of New Zealand did not seek to enter Parliament."

Mr. Seddon, however, is misinformed regarding the ambitions of New Zealand women, and errs in supposing that, having secured the ballot, they are content

to be shut out of Parliament. The leading address at the annual meeting of the Women's National Council of New Zealand, in 1901, as was mentioned in the last number of *THE REMONSTRANCE*, had for its subject—"The Disabilities of Women," and made the following surprising enumeration of them:—

"It was left for New Zealand to devise the modern compromise of the vote without the seat. Now an exclusively male House frames unequal and unfair laws for both sexes, and has even passed such in spite of the protest of large numbers of both men and women. . . . We are told it would be unwomanly for women to sit in Parliament. . . . The National Council has often pointed out the need there is for women justices, both as visitors to our female prisoners and on the bench, but nothing is done. There are many competent women whose services as jurors are at present a real need to the community. It appears a woman in New Zealand cannot now legally take her seat on either school boards or committees."

The council also passed unanimously the following resolution:—

"Resolved, That, in the opinion of this council, the time has come when all disabilities which at present hinder women from sitting as members of either of the houses of legislature, or from being elected or appointed to any public office or position in the colony, should be removed, and that with regard to all powers, rights and duties of citizens absolute equality should be the law of the land."

It would appear from the foregoing that even in New Zealand, which is so often held up as an example in the matter of woman suffrage, women are still very far from being on a political equality with men.

DEFEAT IN IOWA.

IOWA and Massachusetts were the two states upon which the energies of the woman suffragists were chiefly expended last year. The defeat of suffrage measures in Massachusetts is described elsewhere. In Iowa, during the summer and autumn of 1901, the National Woman Suffrage Association carried on an active campaign. Its president, Mrs. Catt, spoke in all parts of the state, leagues were formed for influencing public sentiment and the election of legislators, and before the legislature met full confidence was expressed of favorable action. The Senate complimented the suffrage workers by a favoring vote; but the House committee, by a vote of 8 to 3, reported that action should be "indefinitely postponed." The House, without debate, voted 56 to 38 to accept this adverse report.

THE TAX-PAYING SUFFRAGE DILEMMA.

THE anomaly involved in the idea of giving the ballot to women who are taxpayers, and withholding it from those who are not, when no distinction is observed between the corresponding classes of men, is recognized even by so ardent an advocate of woman suffrage as the *Boston Transcript*. That journal, in its issue of February 23, 1900, pointed out the tax-paying suffrage dilemma thus:—

In speaking of the defeat of the Woman Suffrage Bill, says the *Advertiser*: "In this Commonwealth there are many women taxpayers who have no word whatever to say on questions of debt or taxation." This is very true, and in equity it ought not to be so. But in what manner shall justice be done to these taxpaying women? If the suffrage is given to them because they are taxpayers, the women who are not taxpayers are discriminated against. On the other hand, if all women are given the suffrage, the ranks of the non-taxpayers are immensely increased. In municipal affairs, at least, is not the number of voters who have no personal interests immediately at stake quite large enough as it is? If it be said that this is a country where all men are equal, it must follow that all women are equal; that is to say, if the suffrage belongs to women at all, it belongs to all, regardless of whether they contribute directly to the support of the government or not. It is wholly inconsistent to argue that women who pay taxes have a right to vote not possessed by women who do not pay a tax, unless a like differentiation is made in the case of the men. It all comes to this—that the suffrage must be given to all women or none, or that only those men who pay taxes shall be permitted to vote. Here is a dilemma. How is it to be escaped from?

NOT A LITTLE THING.

ADVOCATES of woman suffrage often try to overcome the reluctance of women to seek the ballot by telling them what a small matter voting is. Just a few minutes, they say, spent in getting registered, and a few minutes more in going to the polls to deposit your ballot, and the thing is done.

But is this all? How does this statement of the case agree with the argument that the ballot in the hands of women is to be a means of great social and political improvement? If women are to make society better by their use of the ballot, it can only be by using it on the whole more conscientiously, more intelligently and

more wisely than men. It is not enough that they should be just as good voters as men, they must be better voters, otherwise the condition of society cannot be improved by admitting them to political privileges. To all who are familiar with modern political conditions, it is clear that there are already too many men voters who hold their political responsibilities lightly and regard them as fulfilled when they have merely cast a vote. If the ballot should be granted to women, and women should take the view of it which is urged upon them by these suffrage advocates, that all that it need involve is the getting registered and the casting of a vote, both processes taking only a few minutes of time, the result would be only a doubling of the careless and unintelligent vote.

If women, as voters, are to improve political conditions, it must be by patient study of public questions, by a wide acquaintance with the careers of public men, and by a conscientious performance of public duties. But, in entering upon such a task, women are handicapped by other duties which press upon them inexorably and from which no one suggests any relief. In the great majority of cases they have neither the time nor the inclination for grappling with public and political questions. To thrust such responsibilities upon a sex already overburdened would be a proceeding which could be justified only by some extreme public need; and even then it would be wise to inquire what likelihood there was that the need would be met by it.

AN IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE.

It should be borne in mind that what is described as "taxpayers' suffrage for women," as it exists in Montana and other Western states, is something very different from municipal suffrage for taxpaying women, as demanded in Massachusetts and other New England states.

"Taxpayers' suffrage" gives to women who are taxpayers the right to vote upon all questions as such public improvements, the incurring of local indebtedness, etc., which may be directly submitted to taxpayers as such. Such questions are submitted but rarely: they are disposed of by a single vote, and they involve no consequences outside of the issues immediately involved.

But municipal suffrage for taxpaying women, as demanded in Massachusetts

and other New England states, implies that women who pay taxes shall participate, on the same terms as men, in the election of town and city officials; shall share equally with men all the responsibilities of municipal finance and government, and shall be eligible equally with men to municipal offices.

Evidently it would not be fair reasoning to make taxpayers' suffrage in Montana, for example, a precedent for the demand for municipal suffrage for taxpaying women in New England.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO.

As to the practical workings of woman suffrage in the states where women vote on the same terms as men, the advocates of suffrage are in the habit of citing the testimony of men who hold elective offices or are in active political life. As these men look for support to women as well as to men voters, their testimony cannot be regarded as wholly disinterested. It would be too much to expect from them the expression of an opinion which might concentrate against them the votes of one half of their constituents.

A bit of impartial testimony was made public, however, last year, in the form of an interview at Washington, with Judge Moses Hallett, of Denver. In this interview, as reported in the *Denver Republican*, of April 6, 1902, Judge Hallett said:—

"Our state has tried the female suffrage plan a sufficiently long time to form a fair idea of its workings. I am not prejudiced in any way, but honestly do not see where the experiment has proved of benefit. The presence of women at the polls has only augmented the total votes; it has worked no radical changes. It has produced no special reforms and it has had no particular purifying effect upon politics. There is a growing tendency on the part of most of the better and more intelligent of the female voters of Colorado to cease exercising the ballot. They still go to the polls, but need to be urged by some of their male relatives.

"I do not believe that there will be any abrogation of the suffrage right of the women of our state, for the reason that no man who aspires to office would risk their displeasure by advocating the repeal of the law. At the same time, if it were to be done over again, the people of Colorado would defeat woman suffrage by an overwhelming majority."

It should be added that Judge Hallett has been United States district judge for the district of Colorado for the last twenty-six years. He was a member of the Territorial Council and chief justice of the Supreme Court when Colorado was a territory, and few men in the state can have had longer or better opportunities for becoming familiar with its affairs.

(From the BROOKLYN EAGLE, October 27, 1902.)

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

ELIZABETH CADY, daughter of the late Judge Daniel Cady and widow of Henry Brewster Stanton, long time a lawyer and a newspaper man, died at the advanced age of eighty-six, in her home in Manhattan, on Sunday afternoon. She was the mother of four sons and two daughters, all of whom are respectably settled and usefully employed in the world. As a wife her lot was devoid of scandal; as a mother her duties were well performed, and as a writer and agitator her activity was constant.

Mrs. Stanton received from many tutors, of whom her great father was the chief, an excellent education. Her marriage to Henry B. Stanton fortunately brought to her the aids of his wide reading, correct literary style, fine journalistic touch, and excellent judgment of the best methods effectively to stir public attention. Such a man as Daniel Cady for a father and Henry B. Stanton for a husband could hardly help making of such a woman as this one was a tense exponent and a vitalizing agitator of whatever proposition she might espouse.

At the same time, during all the many years of her life, her endeavors coincided with an increasing disposition among men to liberalize law, to throw over women its protections, and to open for them avenues of new employments. This disposition of men was as evident in Great Britain as in the United States. It was the result of education, of an innate sense of justice, and of the general upward trend of civilization in the world, especially in as much of the world as was under the influence of the aggressive Anglo-Saxon race. Mrs. Stanton, while antagonizing none of the results for womanhood in law thus achieved, and while advocating a few of them from the standpoint of a suffragist, may be said to have contributed little, if anything, to their final attainment, and is believed by many thoughtful folk unintentionally to have retarded them, by persistently asking of governments and of public opinion exactly what they would not grant, and by persistently demanding, as if for womanhood, what the general mass of womanhood not only did not desire, but rejected and even resented.

This fact is illustrated by men's voluntary concession to women of rights of ownership of property, of right of alienation of property, of right of control over separate businesses, and of the power to will away property, without any lien in husbands upon it, equivalent to the dower of widows in the estate of their consorts. Indeed, man-made law has been much more generous to women in these respects than to men themselves, women thus getting from the justice or chivalry of men more than men retained for themselves or demanded on their own account.

The fact was a perpetual quash of Mrs. Stanton's terrific indictment of men for not extending to women that to which the general mass of women in cultivated states were and are absolutely and even bitterly opposed. The favoring attitude of man-made law to women and the hostile or indifferent attitude of general womanhood to suffrage stood out in almost comical contrast to the propositions for which Mrs. Stanton

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1900.

Proposed woman suffrage amendments to state constitutions were rejected by the legislatures of Iowa and Ohio, and defeated at the polls in Oregon. A municipal suffrage bill was defeated in Massachusetts, and a women taxpayers' municipal suffrage bill in Vermont.

IN 1901.

In Alabama, the constitutional convention rejected a proposition to admit women to the franchise in municipal elections called for the purpose of issuing bonds or incurring debt. Proposed constitutional amendments conferring suffrage upon women were defeated in the legislatures of California, Indiana, Oregon, South Dakota and Wisconsin. In Kansas a presidential suffrage bill was defeated, and in New Mexico a school suffrage bill, and in Connecticut and Massachusetts municipal suffrage bills were defeated.

IN 1902.

In Connecticut, the constitutional convention, April 1, rejected a resolution giving women the full right of suffrage.

In Iowa, a resolution to submit a suffrage amendment to the constitution was favorably acted on by the Senate, but was adversely reported to the House, 8 to 3, and the adverse report was accepted 56 to 38.

In Kentucky, the legislature passed a bill repealing the law which had allowed women to vote for school officers in second-class cities.

In Massachusetts, bills for municipal suffrage for taxpaying women, for license suffrage for women qualified to vote for school committee, and allowing women to participate in caucuses for school committee were adversely reported, and the reports accepted without a roll-call. An amendment to the constitution to strike out the word "male" was adversely reported, and an attempt in the House to substitute a resolve for the committee report failed by a vote of 45 to 137, with 16 pairs.

In New York, a bill giving women in third-class cities the right to vote upon tax propositions passed the House but failed in the Senate. The legislature passed a bill repealing the law of 1892, which gave women in towns the right to vote for school commissioners, on the ground that it was unconstitutional. (The question whether a taxpayer's franchise is constitutional for either men or women is before the Supreme Court, when this record closes. If the decision is in the negative, it will invalidate the grant of suffrage to taxpaying women in towns and villages made by the Act of 1901.)

In Vermont, the House, by a vote of 67 to 138, defeated a proposition to admit women to the vote on the local option referendum. The Senate defeated a Presidential suffrage bill, 6 to 22, and the Senate also rejected a municipal suffrage bill.

so persistently and unsuccessfully agitated. Her very persistence, however, and the unusual age which she attained, encouraged her and her friends in a casuistic or declamatory endeavor to identify the gains women did make, at the hands of men, with the endeavors of Mrs. Stanton for what women did not acquire, because emphatically women did not want it. This confusion and delusion may be said to be prevalent. It augments the self-complacency of which it is the product. It was unwittingly assisted by the act of raw states, catering for population, in admitting women to suffrage, with results which rebuke the grant. It is easily convertible into affectionate tribute by sophistical ingenuity or loving error. It mates with the natural reverence toward courage, consistency, and old age, of which Mrs. Stanton became the impressive illustration.

To the last her mind was unclouded, her concentration of purpose unimpaired. Her grievance against state and church (church being a conjuring name with the womanhood which alike rejects and resents the idea of any woman suffrage), and her well-nigh vitriolic objections to the Bible as a volume, which, in her opinion, subjects women to men, continued to the end of her days. But this rather increased than diminished her prominence as a public worker, albeit it materially impaired the productiveness of that work. History will distinguish between the earnestness of her motives and the failure of her efforts, between the sincerity of her convictions and the futility of her objects, between the excellence of her character and the bitterness of her crusades against the divine order of the world and the benign results under that order in governments, between her effort to overdo woman as a factor and her liability to underdo woman as an influence. She will be accurately estimated, suitably honored, adequately remembered, and the forces themselves which she vainly assailed will willingly concede that her country was more picturesque because of her life, and will be less so without it.

"FORTUNATELY, no logician has ever been able to argue the human family into antagonism by emphasizing its halves."

WOMAN SUFFRAGE DEFEATS.

THE Boston Herald of September 12, 1902, commented editorially as follows upon the present aspect of the woman suffrage movement:—

From leaflets sent out by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, it appears that during the last six years the cause of woman suffrage has encountered in various ways sixty defeats in twenty-eight states of the Union. In four states—Minnesota, Delaware, Louisiana, and New York—there has been limited suffrage granted to women for certain specific purposes; but from present appearances the movement seems to have reached its culmination; at least there is not much promise of any material advance in the immediate future, assuming that the organized work of those women who are opposed to the change continues in the future to be as active as it has been. The advances secured in the past have been largely due to the assumption on the part of those who were prominent in promoting them that they (the promoters) represented an enormous but silent class of our people, who felt that the laws relating to suffrage in force in this country were, so far as they were concerned, unjust restrictions. But since these opposition societies have been founded in a number of the different states of the Union, the question has assumed a new and different phase. The anti-suffragists maintain, with not a little reason, that they represent the vast majority of their sex, and that their wishes, rather than those in the minority, should be heeded by legislators.